arXiv:1702.01262v2 [cs.SI] 7 Feb 2017

Class attendance, peer similarity, and academic performance in a large field study

Valentin Kassarnig[a,*], Andreas Bjerre-Nielsen[b,c], Enys Mones[d], Sune Lehmann[d,e], David Dreyer Lassen[b,c]

[a] *Institute of Software Technology, Graz University of Technology, Graz, Austria*
[b] *Center for Social Data Science, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark*
[c] *Department of Economics, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark*
[d] *Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark, Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark*
[e] *The Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark*

Abstract

Identifying the factors that determine academic performance is an essential part of educational research. Existing research indicates that class attendance is a useful predictor of subsequent course achievements. The majority of the literature is, however, based on surveys and self-reports, methods which have well-known systematic biases that lead to limitations on conclusions and generalizability. Here we propose a novel method for measuring class attendance, using data collected from smartphone sensors. We demonstrate that early and consistent class attendance strongly correlates with academic performance. In addition, positive correlation is observed when comparing attendance of peers, suggesting either a strong peer effect or homophily with respect to attendance.

Keywords: absenteeism, academic performance, data collection, homophily, peer effect

Introduction

An increasing number of individuals seek a high level of education to secure their future and improve their economic possibilities [1]. Academic performance is an essential factor in the success of the post-education period with respect to employment [2]. For this reason, the ability to predict students' academic success has been the subject of increasing interest. The knowledge regarding expected academic performance is also a valuable input for educators and school administrators, as this information can be used to identify and target vulnerable students at risk of dropping out or in need of additional attention. However,

*Corresponding author. Institute of Software Technology, Graz University of Technology, Inffeldgasse 16B/II, 8010 Graz, Austria.
Email address: kassarnig@ist.tugraz.at (Valentin Kassarnig)

gathering information about attendance levels using conventional methods (surveys or self-reports) is subject to inherent biases [3] and moreover, can be costly to gather at the scale of schools or universities.

To overcome these limitations, we propose a new measure that leverages data collected via smartphones based on the combination of individual GPS signals and data on person-to-person meetings measured via Bluetooth (see Methods). Using this approach for identifying classes and estimating attendance level from high resolution location and proximity data of almost 1,000 university students, we investigate the relationship between students' attendance and their grades, as well as the social aspects of academic performance. First, we show that knowledge of the students' attendance in the first few weeks is sufficient to estimate performance throughout the school term and subsequent exam performance. Second, we find that attendance behavior is highly correlated among peers, that is, students exhibit behavioral patterns similar to the ones observed among their strongest social ties. Details of the estimation of class attendance is described in Methods.

There is a large body of existing research on class attendance, absenteeism and their impact on academic achievements [4–16] as well as on the relationship between behavior of peers [17, 18]. However, the methodology applied in the large majority of previous work has limitations: results are based on analyzing surveys, sign-in-sheets or other types of self-reports, which are known to be prone to biases and errors [3]. An exception is the study by Zhou et al. [19] where the authors used connectivity data from the wifi network at Tsinghua University. The location of students and consequently their class attendance was determined by studying how students' phones connected to the nearly 2,800 wifi access points with known locations distributed over university campus. Based on nine weeks of observations, Zhou et al. found that students with higher GPAs attended classes at a higher rate. Moreover, compared to low performing students, they were also found to be more likely to arrive late to class.

The *StudentLife* study takes a different approach to measure class attendance, namely by using the location data recorded on students' phones [16]. Students are considered to be at class when they spend at least 90% of the scheduled period at the class location. The authors found a significant drop in attendance immediately after the first three weeks. Although there were variations observed in class attendance, they found no relation between final grades and absence (either initial level or the pace of absence over the term). A possible explanation of the observations in the *StudentLife* study is the small sample size (< 50 students) which limits the discriminative power between hypotheses and restricts generalizability.

Most existing studies have, however, found that class attendance is a significant and positive predictor of course grades [4–15]. More specifically, Crede et al. [14] conclude that attendance is the most accurate known predictor of academic performance. Other experiments have quantified the importance of attendance on exam performance through mandatory attendance [11] and intentionally omitting parts of the curriculum [13], and both found a significant effect on the number of exam questions answered correctly. In addition to gen-

eral attendance throughout the semester, initial attendance has been shown to be an important predictor of academic success [4]. Previous results also indicate that average attendance drops over the course of the semester, irrespective of performance [6, 20, 21].

The connection between attendance and peer behavior has been explored to a lesser extent. Only a few preliminary observations exist in the literature based on co-occurrence at class or workplace [17, 18, 22–24]. One example is the work of De Paola, where individual absence behavior was found be related to peer group absenteeism [24]. Yet these studies are limited by having no access to data regarding actual communication or interactions.

Methods

Data

We employ data collected in the Copenhagen Networks Study (CNS) [25]. As part of the CNS project, various data types were recorded by dedicated smartphones from nearly 1,000 students at the Technical University of Denmark (DTU), over a period of 2 years. The channels for data collection include location (using GPS), proximity of other students (via Bluetooth scans) and mobile phone communication. The CNS covered the academic years 2013/14 and 2014/15 which form the basis of our analysis. Course grades and schedules were provided by the Technical University of Denmark. Note that due to the possibility of exiting the experiment at any given point, the number of participants varied over time. For details of the CNS project and a short overview of the obtained data please refer to [25].

Class location and attendance

In order to estimate class attendance, we first calculate the location of the class for each week of the semester, and then this location is used to determine the attendance of each eligible student (see Fig. 1). We calculate class locations as follows. First, the list of course participants and the associated class times were retrieved from the list of course grades and the course page archive, respectively. To improve the accuracy of class estimation, we only consider courses with the standard DTU length of 4 hours and with at least 8 participants. A significant fraction of classes do not have a fixed location throughout the 4-hour period as the students may change building or room. Therefore, the designated time of the class is divided into sixteen 15-minute bins, and class location is estimated for each bin separately, with our results being robust to changes of bin size. For a particular time bin, we determine the group of students who are most likely attending the class using the proximity data from the Bluetooth scans representing nearby co-students within a distance of 15m. The cluster is defined by the student with the highest degree and their ego-network, from among the students participating a course. This method of determining the primary cluster is robust against false negatives present in Bluetooth scans and therefore provides clusters that are more stable across multiple bins, compared

to using the giant component of the proximity network (the latter may result in long chain-like subgraph which is not realistic in the context of a class). Once the main cluster is found, the location of the class is defined by the median location of the members in the cluster, using their location with the highest accuracy during the 15-minute period. In case of the estimated location is inside the university campus, we accept it as the location for the class in the corresponding time bin (shown in Fig. 1a).

The attendance of a participant is based on their location relative to the estimated class location in each bin. All students who are no further than 200m from the estimated class location are assigned to the class and are assumed to attend in the specific time bin (all results are robust against variations in the distance threshold in the range 5 - 500m). The value of 200m is explained by the noise in the measurement of location, especially when using GPS data inside buildings [26]. Members of the main cluster are automatically assigned to the class. Figure 1b shows the estimated locations for a specific course throughout the semester.

We have also tested our method against the actual course schedules and their locations. Fig. 2 shows the cumulative distribution of error in distance based on more than 26,000 class location estimations. More than 75% of estimated locations are found to be within the range of 100m of the scheduled location, and a 200m threshold includes 90% of the classes. Note that the error is estimated using the center of the corresponding building, and therefore the actual error is typically lower than our estimate.

A likely interpretation of the observed differences between estimated and official locations is that the estimation may correspond to the actual location where the class took place (in case of relocation), whereas the official records did not show the changes.

We have implemented an interactive visualization tool accompanying the paper that helps understand our approach. The tool is available on GitHub: valentin012.github.io/class-loc-d3/.

Social ties

The exchange of text messages between two people suggests a strong social tie [27] and thus, we use this to infer the students' social connections. That is, for each student, the list of their peers is constructed by those participants they have sent to or received a message from. For the sake of simplicity and based on the sparsity of the network of text messages, we did not set any lower limit on the number of messages exchanged, that is, a single message creates a link in our network.

Results

In the following we measure attendance patterns for a group of students at the Technical University of Denmark (see Methods for an explanation of how attendance is computed). First, we show that attendance is indeed correlated

with grades achieved both at the level of a specific course and overall performance (i.e. average term grade). Second, we look at the temporal aspects and show that irrespective of performance there is a general decrease in attendance over the course of a semester. However, the attendance behavior of low and high performing students displays substantial differences with respect to time. Finally, we show to what extent individual students share similar attendance patterns with their social peers.

Academic achievement

Figure 3 shows the aggregate statistics for all grades (all courses and students considered) as a function of the final grade. Grades are defined following the Danish grading system that spans between -3 and 12 with 7 distinct grade points (we also denote the corresponding grades according to the US system): -3 and 00 (grade F), 02 (grade D), 4 and 7 (grade C), 10 (grade B) and 12 (grade A). A positive correlation can be observed in Fig. 3, with respect to the mean and median, which is quantified by a Spearman correlation of .255 ($p < .001$). Observations where the individual fails to show up at the exam are excluded. The two plots at the boundary of the range (-3 and 12) show distinct, well-separated boxes marking a significant difference in the distributions.

To further quantify the observed trend corresponding to the level of attendance, we divide the population into five quintiles based on the students' attendance and measure the performance inside these groups (see Fig. 4). The distribution of attendance is illustrated in Fig. 4a, where each group is represented by a single bar and the width of the bars is adjusted to span over the covered attendance level. The majority of the students is characterized by a high attendance (60% of the students attend more than 75% of the classes). The height of the bars (mean term grade) show the observed correlation between attendance and performance. The actual distribution of grades also shows variations over the attendance groups, as displayed in Fig. 4b. Low attendance (leftmost) results in a broad distribution of grades, indicating that the performance is not solely a function of the attendance but strongly depends on other factors. However, groups of high attendance (middle to right) develop a peak at grade 7 and are characterized by an increasingly dominating likelihood of high grades. The rate of failing (grade -3 and 00) in exams drops from 23% (leftmost histogram) to less than 4% (rightmost histogram). Also note that there is no significant difference between the grade distribution of the last two attendance groups, suggesting that attendance is better at discriminating between whether or not a student is likely to fail rather than predicting the actual grade achieved provided that the student passes the exam. To statistically evaluate the variation in the distribution over the groups, we perform a two-sided Mann–Whitney u-test; results are shown in Table 1, where we record the p-values that correspond to the hypothesis that the observations come from the same distribution. While frequencies found in neighboring groups (e.g., groups 3 and 4, groups 4 and 5) are statistically likely to have the same underlying distribution, groups separated by at least one quintile are significantly different, further supporting our remarks in Fig. 4b. Although attendance accounts for a significant fraction

of variation observed in the distribution of grades, it should be noted that this does not necessarily indicate a causal effect.

Temporal effects

Besides differences in attendance across the population, there is also varying attendance for individual students over the duration of the semester (Fig. 5). For the sake of simplicity, we divide our observation of student and course into three groups: the first group is characterized by low grades in the course (grades -3, 00 and 02); the second is moderate performance (grades 4 and 7,) and; finally high achievers (grades 10 and 12). With about 41%, moderate performers constitute the largest fraction of nearly 8,400 observations, followed by high (37%) and the low achievers (22%). We compute average attendance for each group over the semester (see Fig. 5a) and observe a general decrease. Further, low performers show a drop already in the first week with an attendance level 10% lower than that of the high performers. The corresponding Mann–Whitney tests suggest significant difference between low and moderate or high performers ($p < .001$), but statistically less significant difference between moderate and high performers ($p < .05$) This initial difference increases further throughout the semester as the rate of absence among low performers is significantly higher compared to the moderate and high performer groups. This difference in the slopes is portrayed in the accompanying inset of Fig. 5a, where we show the distribution of slopes measured in all pairs of data points in the trends of the main plot. The distribution of slopes calculated over pairs of data points within the trend of low performers is clearly separated and significantly different from those describing moderate and high performers. The total drop in the attendance among low performers is above 20% points, compared to the 10% points and 8% points observed among the moderate and high performers. These differences in the trends are further supported by a Theil–Sen estimation for slopes: -1.4 % points/week for low performers, opposed to the -.6 and -.4% points/week measured in the moderate and high performer groups. Note that differences in the decrease in attendance are not significant between moderate and high performers, also supporting the hypothesis that (the absence of) attendance affects the failing rate to a higher extent than the actual grades. Finally, at the end of the semester, the initial difference inflates to 24% points between low and high performers due to the faster dropping rate. In summary, the temporal attendance behavior of different types of students differs in the way that low performers start out with a lower attendance rate which also decreases more rapidly throughout the semester compared to that of moderate and high performers.

Peer similarity

Next we investigate the social aspects of academic performance and attendance: in Fig. 5b we plot the mean attendance level of the peers in the different performance groups. For each individual, we create a list of their strongest ties and then calculate the average attendance of them. Strong social contacts are inferred from text message exchanged between two students, as this form

of communication indicates a strong bond [27]. On average, each student has exchanged text messages with 4.4 other students from among the participants. Surprisingly, we observe the same differences as above, although less pronounced than in the individual trends: the peers of the low performers also display lower attendance. This supports previous findings on homophily and peer effects: students communicate more with others who are similar in performance (note that contacts are based on text messages and not on physical proximity).

The observed correlation between own attendance and attendance measured in the ego-networks (the student and their contacts) is clear at the individual level as well. In Fig. 6 we plot the attendance of contacts as a function of the students own attendance, along with the density of observations (color of the plot). The correlation of .48 measured between own and peers' attendance is clearly visible in the scatter plot. Furthermore, as shown in Fig. 6 by the relative density of data points, the number of students is characterized by a peak in peer attendance for high own attendance (above 60%). In other words, peer attendance has a narrow distribution at high attendance levels, compared to the more broad distribution observed below own attendance of 50%. The pattern of similarity is robust against removal of class-level effects as seen in Fig. 7 of the Supporting Information. The class effects are removed by subtracting the mean attendance for each class that took place thus we compute deviations from the local class mean. Robustness of the results suggests that the similarity is driven by homophily or peer effects.

Discussion

In this paper, we introduced a novel high precision method to measure class attendance in an academic setting. Contrary to previous studies, our method overcomes various limitations caused by restricted data collection techniques. The accuracy of the method makes it possible to scale our measurement and allows for very high precision inference of attendance compared to standard survey-based measurements. Applying our method to a population of nearly 1,000 university students, we have shown that in this population attendance is not only highly correlated with academic success (supporting previous studies) but it is also reflected in the social interactions, which show that students of similar performance tend to be clustered in the network. Our results suggest a strong mixture of either sorting or peer effects which appears early in the semester and spans across the entire term.

Based on the detailed measurements, we then investigated the temporal aspects of attendance. A general decreasing trend describes the entire population in our dataset, however, there is a clear difference with respect to the pace and level of the effect conditional on performance, indicating a strong early differentiation in behavior between low performers and the rest of the population. Interestingly, this effect vanishes when moderate and high performers are compared. This distinction between low performers and all others is also present in the aggregate statistics of attendance as well: rate of failing drops by 80% (compared to the value measured in the low attendance quintile) once

the attendance reaches the 75% threshold. These results indicate that the effect of attendance on performance shows a complex pattern: while attendance is a strong predictive measure for the failing rate, the effect is less pronounced at high attendance levels and high performance.

Using the contacts obtained from mobile phone communications, we were able to investigate the social aspects of attendance. We found that homophily is present in all groups of academic performance levels, however, it is stronger among high performers. This is supported by an overall robust trend observed in the relative attendance (compared to peers) among high performers, as well as in the correlation between own and peer attendance at the individual level.

We note, however, that our method and the results have some limitations that we address in the following. First, estimation of class locations is based on Bluetooth and GPS signals, both of which are subject to noise. We briefly outline how we mitigate these errors. Our approach is to first identify clusters of physical meetings. We do this by including every Bluetooth signal found between two devices, irrespective of the signal strength, which results in contacts within a typical distance of 10-15m [28]. Although scans may fail we reduce the resulting error by employing scans from both devices between two students – this only requires one successful scan and therefore the error should be minimal. Subsequently we employ the identified clusters to estimate the class location. By using the median location of the most connected student within the cluster we remove noise inherent in location data. After applying our corrections, less than 10% of the estimated class locations are found to be outside of the 200m radius around the official locations.

Note that we do not control for personal characteristics. However, in [29], attendance is shown to be an important predictor of subsequent performance when controlling for performance of friends and personality. Also, our estimates are not causal estimates of attendance, cf. [11, 13] as the choice of attendance is likely to be correlated with other factors. That is, when a student attends more classes it is not likely to lead to a change in achievements equal to the one we observe. This is due to the fact that attendance and performance could be driven by same latent factor which is both fixed and unobserved to us as researchers.

Another limitation comes from the fact that we have measurements on a subset of all students enrolled in the courses. As an illustration, around 40% of first year students accepted a phone from among the entire cohort of freshmen. The students who participated in the study are different from the average student as they achieve higher grades [30]. We nevertheless observe high variation with respect to attendance and performance within our dataset and thus, we arguably believe that our results are appropriate precursors of the trends present in the larger student population.

We have demonstrated the connection between attendance and performance, however, attendance alone does not imply active participation. Students who attend class may or may not participate actively in class activities, and although no significant correlation has been observed e.g. between seating position and performance [4], it is still unknown what other factors contribute to the aca-

demic performance. Our methods could be used in conjunction with further experiments such as [11, 13] to yield additional insights on effects of class attendance.

Finally, academic performance is a complex question with multiple facets, and limiting the measurement of success to the raw value of grades is an oversimplification of a high dimensional problem. A first concern is that students are susceptible to different subjects and show interest in distinct fields. A more detailed analysis of performance could, e.g., restrict the analysis above to single subjects. Although this would provide a better understanding of individual performance, the aim of the paper was to investigate the connection at the basic level of attendance. Results with different performance levels suggest that attendance is an efficient predictor of failing, indicating that differentiation at higher orders (that is, among good performers) indeed requires more detailed knowledge regarding the individuals themselves. Further research is therefore needed to understand how factors beyond attendance influence academic success.

Supplementary Information

Correcting for course-level attendance

Attendance measured in various classes depends on different factors. One possible explanation for the observed correlations is the individual aspects of the courses: some are entertaining and involving, thus students are highly motivated to attend the classes, while others require less activity and therefore the attendance drops. To account for these course level differences, we calculate the corrected attendance for each class, that is, the attendance of the students, relative to the average attendance in the class. This way, individual differences at the level of courses (and classes) are eliminated and the resulting attendance measures are independent of the actual course. To assess the strength of peer-similarity, we plot the average attendance of the strongest contacts (i.e. communicating by text messages) assigned to the same course for each student as the function of own attendance, shown in Fig. 7. The overall structure of the distribution resembles a straight line, with most of the data points gathering around the diagonal from $(-1, -1)$ to $(1, 1)$. The concentration of points around this diagonal suggests a correlation between self and peer behavior with respect to the corrected attendance as well, further supporting the findings in the main paper.

Subject specific behavior

Correlations vary over the courses with some courses exhibiting high correlation between attendance and the final grade, and others displaying low or moderate correlations. In Fig. 8 we show the probability density of correlations measured over all courses considered in this paper, as well as density functions restricted to specific areas. As the area plots indicate, the distribution of correlations show distinct behavior, strongly related to the field the course corresponds to. Courses assigned to mathematics (with lecturers being affiliated to *applied*

mathematics and computer science or *informatics and mathematical modelling*) show the lowest correlation values with a median correlation of .126. On the contrary, courses affiliated with *chemistry* and *chemical engineering* are characterized by high correlations, marked by a median value of .427. Note that there are a few courses with negative correlation: these are the artifact of low sample sizes (the corresponding significance is low).

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work was supported by the Villum Foundation, the Danish Council for Independent Research, and University of Copenhagen (via the UCPH-2016 grant Social Fabric and The Center for Social Data Science).

Author's contributions

All authors contributed equally to this work.

Acknowledgments

Due to privacy implications we cannot share data but researchers are welcome to visit and work under our supervision.

References

[1] A. P. Carnevale, S. J. Rose, B. Cheah, The college payoff: Education, occupations, lifetime earnings.

[2] D. A. Wise, Academic achievement and job performance, The American Economic Review 65 (3) (1975) 350–366.

[3] N. Eagle, A. S. Pentland, D. Lazer, Inferring friendship network structure by using mobile phone data, Proceedings of the national academy of sciences 106 (36) (2009) 15274–15278.

[4] L. Buckalew, J. D. Daly, K. Coffield, Relationship of initial class attendance and seating location to academic performance in psychology classes, Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society 24 (1) (1986) 63–64.

[5] J. Brocato, How much does coming to class matter? some evidence of class attendance and grade performance., Educational Research Quarterly.

[6] M. L. Van Blerkom, Class attendance in undergraduate courses, The Journal of psychology 126 (5) (1992) 487–494.

[7] S. Devadoss, J. Foltz, Evaluation of factors influencing student class attendance and performance, American Journal of Agricultural Economics 78 (3) (1996) 499–507.

[8] S. E. Gump, The cost of cutting class: Attendance as a predictor of success, College Teaching 53 (1) (2005) 21–26.

[9] G. A. Krohn, C. M. O'Connor, Student effort and performance over the semester, The Journal of Economic Education 36 (1) (2005) 3–28.

[10] T.-F. Lin, J. Chen, Cumulative class attendance and exam performance, Applied Economics Letters 13 (14) (2006) 937–942.

[11] D. R. Marburger, Does mandatory attendance improve student performance?, The Journal of Economic Education 37 (2) (2006) 148–155.

[12] L. Stanca, The effects of attendance on academic performance: Panel data evidence for introductory microeconomics, The Journal of Economic Education 37 (3) (2006) 251–266.

[13] J. Chen, T.-F. Lin, Class attendance and exam performance: A randomized experiment, The Journal of Economic Education 39 (3) (2008) 213–227.

[14] M. Credé, S. G. Roch, U. M. Kieszczynka, Class attendance in college a meta-analytic review of the relationship of class attendance with grades and student characteristics, Review of Educational Research 80 (2) (2010) 272–295.

[15] J. W. Westerman, L. A. Perez-Batres, B. S. Coffey, R. W. Pouder, The relationship between undergraduate attendance and performance revisited: Alignment of student and instructor goals, Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education 9 (1) (2011) 49–67.

[16] R. Wang, F. Chen, Z. Chen, T. Li, G. Harari, S. Tignor, X. Zhou, D. Ben-Zeev, A. T. Campbell, Studentlife: assessing mental health, academic performance and behavioral trends of college students using smartphones, in: Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, ACM, 2014, pp. 3–14.

[17] D. Card, L. Giuliano, Peer effects and multiple equilibria in the risky behavior of friends, Review of Economics and Statistics 95 (4) (2013) 1130–1149.

[18] M. Ejrnæs, A. Holm, D. Le Maire, Should i stay or should i go: Peer effects in absenteeism, Tech. Rep. 3, Centre for Applied Microeconometrics - University of Copenhagen (2014).

[19] M. Zhou, M. Ma, Y. Zhang, K. SuiA, D. Pei, T. Moscibroda, Edum: classroom education measurements via large-scale wifi networks, in: Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, ACM, 2016, pp. 316–327.

[20] A. Nyamapfene, Does class attendance still matter?, engineering education 5 (1) (2010) 64–74.

[21] R. Wang, G. Harari, P. Hao, X. Zhou, A. T. Campbell, Smartgpa: how smartphones can assess and predict academic performance of college students, in: Proceedings of the 2015 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, ACM, 2015, pp. 295–306.

[22] R. Winkelmann, Wages, firm size and absenteeism, Applied Economics Letters 6 (6) (1999) 337–341.

[23] P. Hesselius, J. P. Nilsson, P. Johansson, Sick of your colleagues' absence?, Journal of the European Economic Association 7 (2-3) (2009) 583–594.

[24] M. De Paola, Absenteeism and peer interaction effects: evidence from an italian public institute, The Journal of Socio-Economics 39 (3) (2010) 420–428.

[25] A. Stopczynski, V. Sekara, P. Sapiezynski, A. Cuttone, M. M. Madsen, J. E. Larsen, S. Lehmann, Measuring large-scale social networks with high resolution, PloS one 9 (4) (2014) e95978.

[26] R. Moen, J. Pastor, Y. Cohen, Accuracy of gps telemetry collar locations with differential correction, The Journal of Wildlife Management (1997) 530–539.

[27] K. Van Cleemput, ill see you on im, text, or call you: A social network approach of adolescents use of communication media, Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society 30 (2) (2010) 75–85.

[28] V. Sekara, S. Lehmann, The strength of friendship ties in proximity sensor data, PLoS ONE 9 (7) (2014) e100915.

[29] V. Kassarnig, A. Bjerre-Nielsen, E. Mones, D. D. Lassen, S. Lehmann, Predicting academic performance from behavioral patterns, To be submitted.

[30] A. Bjerre-Nielsen, D. Dreyer Lassen, Opportunity and similarity in dynamic friendships, Tech. rep. (2016).

Figures

Tables

Figure 1: **Estimation of class locations at the Technical University of Denmark campus.** a) Location of the students who were assigned to a specific class (colored small circles), with the estimated location (moderate size red circle) and range of the class (large light red circle) in a particular day. b) Estimated class locations (red circles) of the same course throughout the semester. (Map data: © 2017 Google)



Figure 2: **Accuracy of class location inference.** The curve shows the cumulative distribution of distance error, that is, the distance between the designated location of the class and our estimation based on the location of the students. Dashed lines mark the distance errors of 50m, 100m and 200m along with the corresponding percentage of classes with error below those thresholds.



Figure 3: **Class attendance conditional on grade obtained.** Box plots show median values (solid horizontal line), mean values (red dots), lower and upper quartiles (box outline) and lower and upper fences (quartiles ± IQR, whiskers). Error bars mark standard deviation of the mean. Bar chart above the boxplot shows the number of observations in each grade group.

	Low att.	L-M att.	Mod att.	M-H att.	High att.
Low att.	-				
L-M att.	.011	-			
Mod att.	<.001	<.001	-		
M-H att.	<.001	<.001	.064	-	
High att.	<.001	<.001	<.001	.090	-

Table 1: Results of the two-sided Mann–Whitney u-tests. Reported are the associated p-values for the comparison of grade distribution between each pair of attendance groups with the null hypothesis that the observations come from the same underlying distribution.



Figure 4: **Class attendance and performance.** a) Illustration of the five groups based on class attendance. Bars indicate groups of equal size, width corresponds to the span of attendance percentage in the specific group and height shows the mean term GPA. b) Grade distribution inside each attendance quintile. Each group includes at least 373 students.



Figure 5: **Change in class attendance over a single semester.** a) Trends of attendance observed in the three performer groups: low (red circles), moderate (green diamonds) and high performers (blue pentagons), according to the Danish grading system. Inset shows the distribution of slopes measured for each pairs of data point in the trends. b) Mean attendance measured among the contacts of the students based on exchanged text messages.



Figure 6: **Correlation between own and peers' attendance.** a) Scatter plot that shows student's own attendance vs mean attendance among contacts at the course level. Color represents the relative density of data points. b) Scatter plot portraying own attendance and mean peer attendance at the class level. Both attendance measures, i.e. own and peer, are subtracted average attendance for the particular class taking place in the course.



Figure 7: **Correlation between self and peer corrected attendance.** Shown are the attendance relative to the average calculated at the level of classes. Each dot represents a student's own and their peers' median deviation from the average attendance with respect to a course, that is, their attendance deviation averaged over all classes of a course.



Figure 8: **Distribution of correlations between attendance and performance.** Grey curve shows the overall probability density of Spearman correlations measured over all courses. Area plots denote the probability density measured for specific fields, dashed lines correspond to the median correlation observed in the field. Scale of the field density plots is shrinked and used only for illustrative purposes.